



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/714,267	11/17/2000	Takayuki Mimura	400929	5181

23548 7590 09/12/2003
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960

EXAMINER

GROSS, KENNETH A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/714,267

Applicant(s)

MIMURA, TAKAYUKI

Examiner

Kenneth A Gross

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,562,436) in view of Redford et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,692,858).

In regard to Claim 1, Coleman teaches: (a) a start-up means (Column 23, lines 18-19); (b) at least two scenarios which implement a specific function (Column 20, lines 8-12); (c) a priority level definition storage means for storing a priority level (Column 23, lines 22-23); (d) and a scenario analysis processing means for determining which scenario is to be executed at start-up according to a priority level definition (Column 23, lines 22-23). Coleman does not explicitly teach that the scenario is a text scenario comprised of control codes, nor does he teach a storage means for storing a number of executable steps, nor does he teach determining which steps must be executed at start-up according to the scenario and executing the steps. Redford, however, does teach a system of defining tasks, where each task contains control codes (Figure 2(c), item 48d), a database for storing tasks and task commands (Abstract), and a method for executing steps associated with a scenario when the scenario is designated (Column 21, lines 60-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to develop a system with a start-up means, at least two scenarios which implement a specific function, a priority level definition storage means for storing a priority level, and a scenario

Art Unit: 2122

analysis processing means for determining which scenario is to be executed at start-up according to a priority level definition, as taught by Coleman, where the scenario is a text scenario comprised of control codes, and the system includes a storage means for storing a number of executable steps, and a processing means for determining which steps must be executed at start-up according to the scenario and executing the steps, as taught by Redford, since a scenario would likely execute a series of steps associated with the scenario to carry out the function of the scenario.

In regard to Claim 6, Coleman teaches: (a) a start-up means (Column 23, lines 18-19); (b) at least two scenarios which implement a specific function (Column 20, lines 8-12); (c) a priority level definition storage means for storing a priority level (Column 23, lines 22-23); (d) and a scenario analysis processing means for determining which scenario is to be executed at start-up according to a priority level definition (Column 23, lines 22-23). Coleman does not explicitly teach that the scenario is a text scenario comprised of control codes, nor does he teach a storage means for storing a number of executable steps, nor does he teach determining which steps must be executed at start-up according to the scenario and executing the steps. Coleman further does not teach event information storage means for storing processing information indicating processing to be performed on external data and scenario identification information indicating one scenario to be executed for at least two event identifiers, nor does he teach when an event identifier and external data are input from the external program, executing the corresponding scenario and processing the corresponding external data. Redford, however, does teach a system of defining tasks, where each task contains control codes (Figure 2(c), item 48d), a database for storing tasks and task commands (Abstract), and a method for executing steps associated with a

scenario when the scenario is designated (Column 21, lines 60-62). Redford further teaches sensors that sense cursor and mouse event information, and perform certain processing and carries out certain scenarios according to the event (Column 36, lines 1-8). Redford further teaches when an event occurs from an external program, the corresponding scenario is executed, and processing is carried out which affects the data of the external program (Column 36, lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to develop a system with a start-up means, at least two scenarios which implement a specific function, a priority level definition storage means for storing a priority level, and a scenario analysis processing means for determining which scenario is to be executed at start-up according to a priority level definition, as taught by Coleman, where the scenario is a text scenario comprised of control codes, and the system includes a storage means for storing a number of executable steps, and a processing means for determining which steps must be executed at start-up according to the scenario and executing the steps, and an event information storage means for storing processing information indicating processing to be performed on external data and scenario identification information indicating one scenario to be executed for at least two event identifiers, as taught by Redford, since a scenario would likely execute a series of steps associated with the scenario to carry out the function of the scenario.

3. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,562,436) in view of Redford et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,692,858) and further in view of Kawano et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,167).

In regard to Claim 2, Coleman and Redford teach the device of Claim 1, but do not teach that said scenario analysis processing means generates a source program based on the text

scenario executed and data generated by the scenario. Kawano, however, does teach a program, which is a task that carries out a function, which executes and generates a source program based on the program executed (Column 16, lines 34-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a device of Claim 1, as taught by Coleman and Redford, where said scenario analysis processing means generates a source program based on the text scenario executed and data generated by the scenario, as taught by Kawano, since automatic code generation reduces the complexity and time factors of manual code generation. Claim 7 corresponds directly with Claim 2, and is rejected for the same reasons as Claim 2.

4. Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,562,436) in view of Redford et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,692,858) and further in view of Hough (U.S. Patent Number 4,604,694).

In regard to Claim 3, Coleman and Redford teach the device of Claim 1, but do not teach a scenario execution trace storage means for storing exclusive execution information for prohibiting the execution of any steps of the other scenarios, wherein said scenario analysis processing means updates this information to either exclusive demand or exclusive release demand included in control code of the scenario and prohibits execution of any other steps when the information indicates exclusive demand. Hough, however, does teach information in the form of a lockword that associated with a task. The lockword is set when a task requires exclusive use of a resource, and hence prevents other tasks from executing during this time (Column 1, lines 49-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a device of Claim 1, as taught by Coleman and Redford, further containing a

scenario execution trace storage means for storing exclusive execution information for prohibiting the execution of any steps of the other scenarios, wherein said scenario analysis processing means updates this information to either exclusive demand or exclusive release demand included in control code of the scenario and prohibits execution of any other steps when the information indicates exclusive demand, as taught by, Hough, since this allows tasks to safely share resources. Claim 8 corresponds directly with Claim 3, and is rejected for the same reasons as Claim 3.

5. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,562,436) in view of Redford et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,692,858) and further in view of Kurii (U.S. Patent Number 4,429,368).

In regard to Claim 4, Coleman and Redford teach the device of Claim 1, but do not teach a scenario execution trace storage means for storing at least one break point for interrupting execution of a text scenario where when the break point is included in a control code or when receiving a point release demand, the scenario analysis processing means writes the break point into scenario execution trace storage, or deletes all existing break points from storage, and interrupts the execution of the scenario while the break point is being written. Kurii, however, does teach break points for interrupting execution of a microprogram as well as an address stack for storing break points (Column 16, lines 38-47). Kurii teaches that break points exist in the microprogram code, and when a break point occurs, the address of the break point is written into the address stack (Column 16, lines 38-47). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a device of Claim 1, as taught by Coleman and Redford, further containing a scenario execution trace storage means for storing at

Art Unit: 2122

least one break point for interrupting execution of a text scenario where when the break point is included in a control code, the scenario analysis processing means writes the break point into scenario execution trace storage and interrupts the execution of the scenario while the break point is being written, as taught by Kurii, since this allows a user to observe a cross section of a program during execution. Claim 9 corresponds directly with Claim 4, and is rejected for the same reasons as Claim 4.

6. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,562,436) in view of Redford et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,692,858) and further in view of Clarisse (U.S. Patent Number 5,247,651).

In regard to Claim 5, Coleman and Redford teach the device of Claim 1, but do not teach a scenario execution trace storage means for storing step execution information for instructing the scenario analysis processing means to execute a scenario step by step, and when a step execution instruction is included in the control code of the scenario, the scenario analysis processing means updates step execution information and executes the scenario step by step according to the step execution instruction. Clarisse, however, does teach a collection of steps of a scenario, each step in the scenario, each step recorded in a computer system. Each step is recorded as a piece of software code related to the scenario, and when the scenario is run, the step is executed according to the instruction (Column 2, lines 39-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a device of Claim 1, as taught by Coleman and Redford, further containing a scenario execution trace storage means for storing step execution information for instructing the scenario analysis processing means to execute a scenario step by step, and when a step execution instruction is

Art Unit: 2122

included in the control code of the scenario, the scenario analysis processing means updates step execution information and executes the scenario step by step according to the step execution instruction, as taught by Clarisse, since this allows a scenario to be defined in easier and more logical steps. Claim 10 corresponds directly with Claim 5, and is rejected for the same reasons as Claim 5.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth A Gross whose telephone number is (703) 305-0542.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

KAG


TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER